

REMARKS

In the prior Office Action, the Examiner found that [dependent] claims 5 and 6 would be allowable if rewritten to be independent of their rejected base claims. Applicant has amended claims 5 and 6 to be independent of claims 1 and 5 while including all of the limitations in prior claims 1 and 5. Consequently, Claims 5 and 6 should now be allowable.

The Examiner previously rejected Claims 1-4 and 7-10 pursuant to 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Richards.

Interviews with the Examiners

Applicant and the Examiners conducted a series of telephone interviews on January 20, 2006, January 24, 2006 and February 14, 2006 during which Applicant's invention and the cited prior art references, including Richards, were discussed. Examiner Canfield suggested that Applicant amend his claims to specify "a singular" cantilever beam. Applicant has so amended all of the claims.

Claims 3, 4 and 7 are dependent on newly amended claim 1. Claims 9 and 10 are dependent on newly amended claim 2. As claims 1 and 2 should be now allowable, claims 3,4,7, 9, and 10, adding additional limitations to claims 1 and 2, should also be allowable. Claim 8 has also been amended to also include the language suggested by the Examiner and additional limitations.

The Examiner previously rejected claims 3, 4, 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Richards in view of Finken, stating it would be obvious that the canvas covering material of Richards could have been provided with cords as taught by Finken.

Applicant's hangar is designed to be: (1) readily assembled by one person requiring a minimal amount of time (2) with minimal number of parts (3) to be portable in kit form when disassembled (4) simple to manufacture and inexpensive for pilots of small planes. In addition, despite its simplicity, Applicant's hangar is designed to be capable of withstanding high velocity winds, wet soil and other harsh environmental conditions.

Richards does not attempt to solve the problem resulting from withstanding high velocity winds or other inclement weather, including wet soil. Neither Richards nor Frinkin recognizes the problem caused when the soil is too wet. As the problem caused by wet soil is not recognized by the prior art, they do not suggest a way to securely attach the hangar to the ground and to maintain the structure in place under these extreme conditions as Applicant's design does.

The anchoring device of applicant's invention includes the rigid, all-thread rod, an angle bracket and three or more sets of nuts and bolts (the threaded rod serves as the bolts). One nut which is sunk into cement underground underneath the hangar, a second nut attaching one plane an angle bracket by bolting to the upright side of the vertical support member and third nut attaching the second plane of the angle bracket to be parallel to the ground.

Finkin, in contrast, uses stays or guys 10 and 12 attached to a truss structure. The guys 10 and 12 serve as tent guide wires. The guys are placed diagonally from the truss structure in Frinkin; they are not vertically situated as with Applicant's vertical support members. As a result of their structure and placement, the guys are substantially more likely to fail than Applicant's vertical support members. The use of guy wires in Frinkin substantially complicate the design

and require a number of additional components to be used with the guy wires: a thrust block (Fig. 6), an assembly junction (Fig. 5), and a “novel chordless truss” (Fig. 18) . These additional components must be used to attach the guy wires to the rest of the structure and significantly increase the complexity of the design and its manufacturing costs.

Further, the guys 10 and 12 are “secured by pegs 16 and 18 driven into the ground” [Col. 3, lines 24-26]. The pegs do not provide the secure anchor that applicant’s mechanism does. The pegs in Finkin are likely to become loose: (1) in high winds and particularly (2) in wet conditions when the soil is saturated. Applicant’s nut and bolt structure, including one set placed some distance underground and reinforced in cement, will withstand both high winds and moist soil. Applicant believes the claims, as amended, are now in a condition for allowance. If there are additional comments or further changes required, Applicant requests a continued telephone interview as agreed in the telephone conference of February 14, 2006.

Dated: February 21, 2006

Respectfully Submitted:



Marcia Devon, Reg. No. 31,947
Attorney for Applicant